I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via	
EFS-Web with the United States Patent and Trademark Office	
onApril 21, 2008	
TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP	
By:	/Maureen Golob/
Maureen Golob	

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Ivy Pei-Shan HSU et al.

Application No.: 09/670,487

Filed: September 26, 2000

For: GLOBAL SERVER LOAD

**BALANCING** 

Customer No. 20350

Confirmation No.: 4335

Examiner: Abdullahi Elmi Salad

PATENT

Docket No.: 019959-003200US Client Ref. No.:FDRY-0001

Art Unit: 2157

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF

**INTERVIEW** 

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Abdullahi Elmi Salad for the telephonic interview regarding this application conducted on March 13, 2008.

The interview participants were Examiner Abdullahi Elmi Salad and Applicant's representative Sujit B. Kotwal (Reg. No. 43,336).

The rejections raised in the Final Office Action dated October 30, 2007 for claims 70 and 86 based upon references Logan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,578,066), and Andrews et al (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0038360) were discussed.

With regards to claim 86, Applicant pointed out that Examiner had not responded to the arguments provided by Applicant in the response filed on February 7, 2007. Applicant pointed out that one of the novel features of claim 86 is that a best network address is selected based, at least in part, on which network address from the plurality of network addresses has been least recently selected as the best network address in response to previous

Hsu et al. PATENT

Application No.: 09/670,487

Page 2

queries. The Examiner indicated that he now had a better understanding of claim 86 and would review the claim based upon this understanding.

With regards to claim 70, Applicant presented various arguments in support of patentability of claim 70 in view of Logan and Andrews. The Examiner requested the Applicant to file a response providing the arguments. An amendment summarizing the arguments is being filed herewith.

The Examiner recommended filing an RCE to allow him to reconsider the allowability of the pending claims. An RCE along with an accompanying amendment is accordingly being filed herewith.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-324-6365.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sujit B. Kotwal/

Sujit B. Kotwal Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834

Tel: (650) 326-2400 Fax: (650) 326-2422

SBK:mg 61314364 v1